DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 304 EA 020 057

AUTHOR Pugh, Wesley C.
TITLE Ethnography and Teacher Efficacy: The Case for Collaborative Teacher Involvement in School Effectiveness.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Ethnography in Education Forum (9th, Philadelphia, PA, February 5-6, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; *Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnography; Instructional Leadership; *Program Implementation; Qualitative Research; *School Effectiveness; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Schools Research

ABSTRACT

School improvement programs emphasizing certain school effectiveness correlates are now fairly common. While program implementation is often a focus of school effectiveness research, teacher efficacy and collaboration are also important. Large-scale aggregate studies viewing students' socioeconomic status as the chief determinant of academic success have been used to support financially conservative policy views and have been criticized for failing to recognize inherent limitations that mask "pockets of excellence." Ethnographic studies of school improvement programs are increasingly being used because statistical analysis is inadequate to describe exemplary practices or to identify and suggest effectiveness models that can be replicated. This paper discusses a recently established educational program addressing student underachievement in a large urban public school system. The research and evaluation design, a classroom implementation checklist, sought to document teacher efficacy through analysis of (1) staffing and instructional grouping characteristics and (2) classroom characteristics and instructional strategies. Results show (1) that a qualitative approach to school improvement program research is needed in order to interpret quantitative findings; (2) that ethnographic or "interpretive research" encourages researchers and subjects to engage in collaborative dialogues; and (3) that critical ethnography must recognize the concept of reflective inquiry between researchers and subjects. Included are 2 summary charts, 39 references, and an appendix containing the implementation checklist. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wesley C. Pugh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED295304

Ethnography and Teacher Efficacy: The Case for Collaborative Teacher Involvement In School Effectiveness Classroom Research

Wesley C. Pugh, Ph.D.
Office of Research & Evaluation
Policy Research
School District of Philadelphia

(Paper presented at the Ethnography In Education Research Forum, Ninth Annual Conference, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., February 5-6, 1988. The research and views expressed in this paper are the author's own, and do not reflect the policy or position of The School District of Philadelphia.)

EA 020 057

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Ethnography and Teacher Efficacy: The
Case for Collaborative Teacher Involvement
In School Effectiveness Classroom Research

This paper makes the argument for collaborative teacher involvement in school improvement programs and classroom research. This study suggests that qualitative research methodology is perhaps the best fit in doing research on school effectiveness practices, based upon an interpretation of data from an ethnography of teachers' classroom practices along with a checklist on teachers' classroom efficacy. In addition, a perspective on critical ethnography will be suggested based on the discussion of collaboration between researcher (ethnographer) and subjects (teachers).

Background

The proliferation of school improvement programs in urban settings is becoming nearly commonplace. Such programs usually emphasize the correlates of school effectiveness: (1) instructional leadership as practiced by principals; (2) instructional emphasis throughout the school; (3) a clean, safe, orderly climate; and, (4) high expectations (Edmonds, 1980; Weber, 1971).

While program implementation is often a chief focus of school effectiveness research, the issue of teacher efficacy is also of paramount importance (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Brophy & Good, 1986; McLaughlin, 1987; Sleeter & Grant, 1986). The analysis of school effectiveness correlates often implies a view of schools as unique entities (Goodlad, 1984; Lieberman & Rosenholtz, 1987). Such a perspective on schools suggests a focus on the classroom process and the role of teachers, though not exclusive of principals' leadership roles and components of school climate.

The school improvement movement in many urban areas is to some degree the antithesis of the school effectiveness research that utilizes large

scale aggregate analysis and emphasizes statistical correlations. School effectiveness studies of this type often suggest that the chief determining factor of in-school success is students' social economic status (SES) (Coleman, et. al., 1966; Walberg & Fowler, 1987).

Large scale aggregate studies, while oftentimes controversial in their findings, have been used by policymakers to support financially conservative educational policy views. However, such studies have also been suspect due to their failure to recognize inherent limitations which mask "pockets of excellence" (Frechting, 1987; Freiberg, 1987; Harvard Education Review, 1973; Stringfield & Teddlie 1987).

The recognition and use of ethnography in the study of school improvement programs has developed, in part, due to the inability of statistical analysis to describe exemplary practices or to identify and suggest models of effectiveness that can be replicated (Katz, 1980). Educational ethnography which focuses on the classroom is one approach to school improvement research that offers the potential to influence educational policy. The involvement of teachers in a collaborative process is a major criterion in research on school effectiveness and teacher efficacy.

The Study

This study examined a research and evaluation design used by a large urban public school system. The design, a classroom implementation checklist utilized by district researchers/evaluators, sought to document teacher efficacy through analysis of (1) staffing and instructional grouping characteristics; and (2) classroom characteristics and instructional strategies.

In juxtaposition to the checklist and derived data, field notes from classroom observations conducted by one researcher are presented in this study to suggest: (1) the need for a qualitative approach to school improvement program research in order to provide insight into quantitative data findings, e.g., "the checklist"; (2) that ethnography as "interpretive research" in classroom settings offers the potential to engage the

researcher and subjects (teachers and students) in a dialogue leading to a collaborative perspective (Erickson, 1986); and, (3) that "critical ethnography" by its very essence must recognize and further acknowledge the concept of collaborative "self-reflection", i.e., "reflective inquiry", between researcher and subject(s) (Argyris, 1985; Bateson, 1972; Polanyi, 1967; Schon, 1983; Simon & Dippo, 1986).

Ethnography and Teacher Efficacy: The Case for Collaborative Teacher Involvement In School Effectiveness Classroom Research

Introduction

This study is a discussion of a recently established educational program which sought to address the problem of students' low achievement in a large urban public school system. Research and evaluations were conducted on the program using a variety of methodologies. This study presents the results of an "implementation checklist" that was used to assess the program's effectiveness. The use of the checklist is the focus of this discussion because it led to the development of the following recommendation: In school improvement research and evaluation, a collaborative process involving researcher(s) and teacher(s) utilizing an ethnographic perspective is a methodology most likely to provide substantive findings. A major premise of this paper is that collaborative research initiatives can produce critical ethnographic perspectives which empower others, and lead to potentially positive changes in individuals and programs.

This study is presented by an educational researcher who utilized an ethnographic perspective. Such a researcher is distinquishable in a number of ways from an anthropologist who does ethnographic research on schooling. Two years of intensive research and evaluation efforts by the researcher occurred prior to the use of a checklist at the schools/classrooms observed in this study.

The School Improvement Program (SIP)

The District's School Improvement Project which began in 1984, is designed to assist selected low achieving schools in replicating the essential elements of successful schools: school climate conducive to learning; schoolwide emphasis on basic skills; a system of clear instructional objectives for monitoring and assessing students' performances; and, a principal who is a strong programmatic leader and who

sets high standards, communicates high expectations, frequently observes classrooms, and creates incentives for learning. Another important component of the program is extensive administrative, teacher, and parent training to develop the necessary support infrastructure. All participating schools follow a standard model relfecting the above emphasis which includes: a School Improvement Council, parent scholars, use of the mandated District curriculum, and development of a positive self-image among students.

The Findings

The following results of the study of teachers' classroom practices in the school improvement program are presented in two forms: (1) quantitative data derived from the "checklist" (see, Appendix A); and, (2) ethnographic vignettes developed from field notes.

The quantitative data were collected by five research and evaluation staff members who spent a half-hour to forty-five minutes in at least one class per grade level at 24 elementary schools and two junior high schools. Prior to the classroom visits, a staff development session was held. Research and evaluation staff reviewed numerous video tapes of teachers and students' classroom interactions. Using the checklist, the research team members discussed their assessments and observations. When discrepancies among the team surfaced, discussions ended with the criterion: "defensible judgment calls" as the basis and rationale for differences between individuals' checklist results. The session produced a consistent 75-85% agreement rate among individuals observing the video tapes. The data to follow can be interpreted as having a reliability quotient of .75-.85 as reflected by the agreement rate from the staff development sessions.

The appropriate use of the checklist based on Summary Chart A, attached, is evident by the quantitative focus, e.g., number of visits to the classrooms, adult-child ratio; whole group vs. small group instructional strategies observed, etc. The discussion of the results from chart A indicated the need for increased parent involvement in the program.

The second checklist summary, (Chart B, attached), focused on classroom characteristics and instructional strategies. The discussion of the results and the conclusions are consistent with the data presented in chart B. The major points emphasized from the results have the following implication: the need for more attention to students performing below grade level, especially as regards to higher expectations, working on non-mastery and direct instruction in thinking skills (School District Research and Evaluation Summary, 1987).

Summary Chart A:

MAJOR STAFFING/INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPING CHARACTERISTICS

GRADES	# CLASSES VISITED	AVERAGE ADULT/ CHILD RATIO	# VISITS TEACHER/ WHOLE CLASS	# VISITS TEACHER/ SMALL GRPS/ INDIVIDUAL	# VISITS AIDES/ SMALL GRPS INDIVIDUAL	# VISITS/ PARENT SCHOLAR/ SMALL GRPS/ INDIVIDUAL	# VISITS VOLUNTEERS/ SMALL GRPS/ INDIVIDUAL
K	23	1/10	21(91)*	5(22)*	9(39)*	3(13)*	1(4)*
1	25	1/14	17(68)	11(44)	10(40)	3(12)	0(0)
2	24	1/14	16(67)	12(50)	12(50)	1(4)	0(0
3	23	1/18	17(74)	12(52)	5(22)	3(13)	0(0)
4	23	1/19	14(61)	13(57)	5(22)	1(4)	0(0)
5	20	1/19	13(65)	9(45)	5(25)	2(10)	0(0)
6	20	1/20	13(65)	8(40)	2(10)	1(5)	0(0)
7	7	1/21	7(100)	2(29)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
8	5	1/28	5(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
9	4	1/26	4(100)	1(25)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)

*Percentages in parentheses

Summary Chart B:

MAJOR CLASSROOM CHARACTERISTICS/INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

GR.	% VISITS POSTED SCHEDULE	% VISITS REMINDERS/ OBJECTIVES	% VISITS DIRECT INSTRUC. THINKING	% VISITS EVIDENCE/ FORMATIVE TESTING	% VISITS EVIDENCE/ INSTRUC. NON-MASTERY	% VISITS USE OF POSITIVE REINFORCE.	% VISITS TEACHER ENCOUR. EXCELLENCE	% VISITS STUDENTS ACTIVELY ENGAGED
K	48%	87%	70%	57%	65%	91%	65%	96%
1	76	88	44	72	72	80	64	92
2	71	83	54	88	83	96	71	100
3	78	70	35	83	61	74	44	91
4	70	83	52	74	70	74	57	91
5	70	80	60	70	75	80	65	100
6	40	70	45	70	60	60	60	90
7	71	86	71	71	71	100	71	100
8	80	100	60	80	80	100	80	100
9	75	75	75	75	100	100	100	75

The data to be presented next derived from observations in eight of the 26 schools in the school improvement project and raises the issues of: (1) ethnography as a comprehensive methodology in the study of schooling; (2) the significance of teacher collaboration; and, (3) the implications for critical ethnography within the context of the collaborative process between ethnographer(s) and classroom teacher(s).

Ethnographic Perspective

Consistent with the original intent of the visits to the schools, this study is not an evaluation. Instead, it is a descriptive narrative of the observations which were conducted as a complement to the implementation checklist. Along with extended classroom visits, teacher interviews and follow-up visits to some of the classrooms occurred. The following summations from ethnographic field notes are what Miles and Huberman (1984) would term "interpretive exemplars," and provide additional insights into the educational practices at both the classroom and school building levels. (Such data support this study's conclusions.)

Observations and Interview Results

At three of the eight schools where classroom activities were observed, the teachers (N=15) reported that they were informed of the visits and were provided copies of the checklist (which were sent to school principals to be distributed to teachers). At these three schools, teachers expressed the view that they regularly performed the practices detailed on the checklist, and they endorsed the checklist as appropriately identifying effective teaching practices.

Observations and discussions with teachers at six of the schools, and the insights of two program evaluators will be presented. The perspectives of the evaluators, along into the interpretive exemplars also provide insight into the school improvement project.

School A: At this elementary school none of the teachers were "prepared" for the observations. That is, the teachers did not know about

the checklist or the purpose of the observations. As a result, the following insights are probably "realistic": In one grade (classroom), the teacher "nearly" wrestles with a student. Chaos was prevalent throughout the room. The teacher presented the lesson in a knowledgeable fashion. She appeared nervous due possibly to the presence of the researcher.

While the teacher attempted to manage/control the class, she performed many of the activities identified on the checklist. Yet, the overall classroom climate was "disorderly."

In other classrooms at the school, the schedules of classroom activities were posted. The teachers were doing lessons that did not coincide with the time schedule. In some classes, upon explaining to the teachers why I was there, they would "resort" to class quizzes, or seat work for students. As a result, I would leave the class and return at a later time period.

The teachers' use of positive reinforcement, and lessons that incorporated direct/indirect thinking and problem solving skills were extremely difficult to assess. One never knew, from the perspective of observer, the teachers' motives versus one's applied interpretations to the class lessons.

School B: One teacher responded to my presence by stating, "I should have stayed at home today."

The teachers were performing "positive classroom learning activities." The perspective that developed from the observations was a pattern that indicated teachers do present lessons "very effectively." The underlying issue is perhaps how effectively are classroom lessons received and understood? Also, to what extent are these practices replicated throughout the school? A related consideration is: If lessons are presented effectively but not understood, is the teaching effective?

Some teachers would teach a math lesson. The math focus was fact-oriented and provided an opportunity for teachers to drill, and thereby

better control the entire class, as students usually were alert to being called upon.

In some classrooms, it was not immediately distinguishable between the teachers and classroom aides, except that the aides seemed to be doing a specific lesson while teachers stood or walked around the classroom observing and supervising students and the flow of classroom activities.

School C: The Union's bulletin board in the teachers' lounge had a notice announcing the classroom observations. A note read, "You may refuse, but we do not recommend it since it may affect funding." The announcement pointed out that the classroom visits were not evaluations but program observations.

The principal at this school was cooperative; she provided me with a list of teachers, room numbers and grade levels. She suggested that I choose any class I wanted to observe. As I left the principal's office and randomly selected classrooms to enter, the principal announced over the public address system, "The central office observer is in the building to visit, and he will share the results of his observations with only you. I will not see the form."

The teachers at this school presented what I believed to be a realistic view of classroom activities. Some teachers did not have rules posted, or lesson objectives were not written on the chalkboard. And yet, they appeared to convey "appropriate" positive reinforcement and positive expectations towards student. (Appropriate in the sense that their actions did not appear to be either contrived or excessive.)

Observations at some schools indicated that where class rules were posted, the lists were "freshly" done signs; while lists at other school visits were partially concealed by charts, or faded due to being seven months into the school year after being initially posted in September.

One teacher wanted to know why her class was selected. She added, "I would have been dressed and ready if I had known."

School D: (Junior High School) - The principal called the day before the observations. He informed me that he had identified the teachers, and he had given each of them the checklist. "So they know what you will be looking for." He also stated, "I was unable to identify all good teachers at all grade levels, but they all should be prepared for your visit."

They were prepared. The class rules and posted schedules were visible on clean, fresh paper. If they had been written with oil paint instead of magic markers there was no doubt in my mind that I could have touched them and gotten wet paint on my fingers.

This was a school environment that could be termed "turbulent." While walking the paper littered hallways, I observed two boys and a girl playfully wrestling. The girl attempted to stab one of the boys with a pencil. She was partially successful, i.e., she glazed him on the arm. They looked at me and ran up the stairs laughling and screaming.

In one classroom, the math teacher showed me his roll book and explained that half the class was out on suspensions. "The remaining students," he stated, "are learners."

Despite the school climate and classrooms that I observed, each department (subject) teacher worked with small groups of students, while a visible number of students (in most instances but not all) were allowed to chat, walk-about, or do anything but subject-matter work.

Two teachers, on consecutive days, were absent in spite of being informed of my visits. In one classroom, in an attempt to gain control over the class, the teacher pleaded with the students, "Let's be on our best behavior," he stated, "we have a visitor." The class sporadically turned their heads to observe me, and they cooperated with the teacher.

In spite of numerous classrooms with posted rules, lesson objectives which were consistent with the checklist, "chaos" permeated many of the classrooms. While teachers appeared to comply with teaching strategies and

other aspects of the checklist, the classroom/school climate minimized teacher efficacy.

School E: The teachers were informed of the observations. Oftentimes while in the classrooms the teachers illustrated nearly every activity listed on the checklist within 10-15 minutes of my visit. As I stayed in the classrooms for longer periods of time, repetition of the checklist activities was absent. Before leaving some classrooms, or after visiting other classrooms and returning, I would share the checklist results. Teachers seemed uneasy with the checklist process. I was hesitant to accept 30 minutes of observations, that teachers were prepared for by the principals, as adequate insight into the educational process. This led to extended observations throughout schools as well as questions asked of teachers, and ultimately this study.

School F: The principal was not present when I observed at this school. However, the teachers seemed receptive to my visits. In some instances, classroom rules or schedules of activities were either not posted or covered by other charts. The teachers were informed of my visit weeks prior to my arrival. They seemed relaxed, and accomplished many of the checklist activities in an unstructured-haphazed(?) manner, i.e., a natural teaching style seemed to be evident, and illustrated artistic pedagogy.

Evaluators' Feedback: Two program evaluators reported that they encountered contrived pedagogy. For example, "the restroom movement"- classroom teachers seemed to "purposely" keep allowing the students to go to the restroom; at other schools, the teachers changed the lesson and informed the evaluator that a math exercise would be a good lesson to observe.

Discussion

The schools discussed in this study are part of a school improvement program in a large urban public school system. The checklist was developed as an efficient means of reporting data findings to funding sources. The checklist was developed by both project administrators and research office

personnel who relied on the school effectiveness literature to derive a list of "effective teaching practices."

A basic premise in this study is that the checklist summaries, which may satisfy funding sources, do not provide policymakers and program administrators/participants with the level of knowledge necessary to make informed decisions on improving/implementing the project. There are admitted limitations to the ethnographic perspective presented here, e.g., the time spent at each setting; the lack of participant observations and interviews with students and para-professionals; and most importantly, the biases and assumptions that emerged from the interpretation of the observation data, which make generalizing at best a cautious step to take.

However, a major point that emerged from this study is the view that researchers and program evaluators who utilize ethnography in the study of school improvement projects can incorporate checklists. While providing policymakers with descriptive narratives and summarized - synthesized findings, ethnographers can increase the potential for successful program implementation. Also, as illustrated herein, observation research provides insight into the educational process.

In the following conclusion, ethnography as a collaborative research methodology will be discussed. A perspective on critical ethnography will be suggested as a means of illustrating ethnography's potential as an "action science" (Argyris, et. al., 1985).

Conclusion

Is this study/report ethnography? Simon and Dippo (1986) raise a similar question about their work, based on their perspectives on critical ethnography. They conclude, "Does it matter if its not?"

While this study did not establish the level of researcher's involvement to constitute "traditional" ethnography, it has raised the issue of: doing research and program evaluation that provides a valid basis for policy initiatives and strategic planning.

This study was a knowledge producing endeavor. It also included reflective inquiry, i.e., a reflection-in-action process by the researcher, in response to utilizing a checklist. This study also implicitly seeks to transform institutional structures, i.e., evaluation and research processes, that attempt to address inequities and low achievement in urban public schools. The aforementioned perspective meets, in part, with the fundamental conditions for ethnographic work (Simon & Dippo). However, it is my contention, "Does it matter?"

This study illustrated the inherent limitation(s) associated with a solely quantitative methdology's attempt to determine implementation of effective school correlates in inner-city classrooms. Whether or not the study approached a "pure ethnography of schooling" (Wilcott, 1982), or whether or not it successfully adhered to the "qualitative research traditions" (Jacob, 1987) may be subject to debate. Neither point seems to be of significance. What matters most in the context of this study is that policymakers and program administrators recognize that ethnography, i.e., qualitative methodology, in research on school improvement programs is "unequivocally" the best fit for understanding the implementation process, and the practices which enhance or suppress student achievement (see e.g., Everston & Green, 1986).

Qualitative research does not exclude quantitative measure (Firestone, 1987; Kidder & Fine, 1987; Spindler, 1982). The use of a checklist, along

with an appropriate interview process (see, e.g., Spradley, 1979), can be incorporated, and are not inconsistent, with ethnography. Additionally, a collaborative process that seeks to engage classroom teachers is perhaps a major ingredient in doing ethnography in education. To involve teachers as research collaborators begins to address some of the "appropriate" criticisms of ethnography as voiced by Argyris (1985). She questions, for example, "the degree to which ethnographic study can contribute to altering the status quo of the system under scrutiny" (p. 159).

Classroom ethnographic work that includes collaboration between researcher, teachers (and principals), is inherently a reflective process based on the interactive and interpretive nature of the collaborative process. As a result, knowledge is generated and participants-observers increase the likelihood for understanding, questioning, and altering structural constraints. Or, it may be that success within structural constraints occurs (Anderson, 1987, p. 16).

Critical ethnography seems to be a potential by-product of research which includes collaboration. Two issues from a list developed by Simon & Dippo (1986, pp. 200-201) which are subsumed under reflective considerations in critical ethnography are:

> We should turn to a consideration of how
> the discourse we use to talk with others
> and through which we write and think,
> <u>silences</u> as well as articulates.
> This is especially important for us white
> males ...
> We must face up to the implications

> of the petit-bourgeois location of
> academic work situated in a
> university economy that structures
> our personal desires, frustrations,
> and assumptions. (Giroux & Simon, 1984)

It seems to me, from a reflective perspective, that in America (and elsewhere), women, African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and others are suppressed by historical and present cultural norms, i.e., social regulations. As a result, one's work, discourse, research, and the fundamental act of living and surviving should be inherent attempts to transform structural constraints, at a minimum, on the individual level.

Given the conditions associated with critical ethnography, one of the quintessential critical ethnographers to live in America was the Dr. Martin Luther King. He had many penetrating views, but when he stated, "There comes a time when people get tired of being trampled over by the feet of oppression;" he was making the connection between generating knowledge, reflecting on one's being, and seeking to transform social and political structural constraints which are correlated with economic and educational inequities.

A salient point being made here is that you don't have to be formally university-trained in ethnography to be a critical ethnographer. For those ethnographers who are university-trained, it is necessary while doing field research to avoid the mystique of being perceived as the sole knowledge producer. Through such avoidance we empower others.

In conclusion, the Educational Researcher (1987) presented a lively, intellectually entertaining, and at times profound discussion of the "self fulfilling prophecy (see, e.g., Wineburg, 1987; Rosenthal, 1987; Rist, 1987). In a rejoinder by Wineburg, he cites the following passage from Rist (1970):

> It should be apparent...that if one desires this

> society to retain its present social class configuration and the disproportional access to wealth, power, social and economic mobility, medical care, and choice of life styles, one should not disturb the methods of education as presented in this study. This contention is made because what develops a "caste" within the classrooms appears to emerge in the larger society as "class"....The question may quite honestly be asked, "Given the treatment of low-income children from the beginning of their kindergarten experience, for what class strata are they being prepared other than that of the lower class?" (pp. 448-449)

Wineburg goes on to conclude, "Here Rist's discussion moves beyond a single teacher, or even two or three teachers in a single school...his discussion goes beyond a group of poor black children...to embrace the disadvantaged everywhere. When he invokes 'caste', he generalizes to a nation.

"Is this a credible account?...I think not" (Wineburg, 1988, p. 44).

From an ethnographic perspective, Rist's work illustrates a micro-analysis based on ethnogrpahy of a classroom. His extrapolations, i.e., generalizations, are a "critical analysis" that suggest a macro-perspective based on a world view, i.e., his outlook on society.

When one's world view is conjoined with one's research, and both are subject to debate, a critical ethnographic perspective may exist as illustrated by Rist's work. If we are open to understanding the knowledge generated from a critical perspective, a positive step is taken in the direction of changing the status quo, and ethnography becomes a methodology for change.

References

Anderson, G. (1987). Toward a critical ethnography of educational administration. Paper presented at American Education Research Assoc., Washington, D.C.

Argryris, D. (1985). The ethnographic approach to intervention and fundamental change. In, Action-Science (Argyrysis, Putnam & Smith, eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an Ecology of Mind. San Francison: Chandler Publishing Co.

Berman, P. & McLauglin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change. Vol. VII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, Ca: Rand Corp.

Brophy, J. & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In, Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd edition, (Wittrock, M.,ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., pp. 328-374.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hesson, C., McPartland, J., et.al. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Edmonds, R. (1980). Search for effective schools. Paper presented at the Strategies for Urban School Improvement Workshop Series, Washington, D.C. ERIC Document ED 212-689.

Everton, C., & Green, J. (1986). Observation as Inquiry and Method. In, Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd Edition (Wittrock, M., editor). New York:Macmillan Publishing Co.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In, Handbook of Research On Teaching, 3rd edition, (Wittrock, M., ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., pp. 119-161.

Firestone, W. (October, 1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. Educational Researcher, (Russell, W.,ed.). Washington, D.C.: AERA Publication, Vol.16, No.7, pp. 16-22.

Frechting, J. (1987). A school district perspective: Questions that aren't being asked. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Freiberg, H. J. (1987). A classroom process researcher's views of school effectiveness research. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Freire, P. (1973). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Glasser, R. (editor). (December, 1987). Educational Researcher. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Assoc., Vol. 16, No. 9.

Giroux, H., Penna, A., & Pinar, W.(editors).(1981). Curriculum and Instruction: Alternatives in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Giroux, H., (1983). Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition. South Hadley, MA.: Bergin and Garvey.

Giroux, H., and Simon, R. (1984). Curriculum studies and cultural politics. Journal of Education. (Boston), Vol. 166, (3), pp. 226-238.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harvard Education Review. (February, 1973). Perspectives on inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America, Vol. 43, No.1.

Jacob, E. (Spring, 1987). Qualitative research traditions: A review. Review of Educational Research, (Peterson, P., ed.). Washington, D.C.: AERA Publication, Vol.57, No. 1, pp. 1-51.

Katz, M. (Fall, 1980). Reflections on metaphors of educational reform. Harvard Graduate School of Education Assoc. Bulletin. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Kidder, L. & Fine, M. (Fall, 1987). Qualitative and quantitative methods: When stories converge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Vol. 35, pp. 57-77.

Lieberman, A & Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The road to school improvement: Barriers and bridges. Paper presented at American Educational Research Assoc. (AERA), Washington, D.C.

Mclaughlin, M. (Summer, 1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implication. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. (Guthrie, J., ed.), Washington, D.C.: AERA Publication, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 171-179.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Source Book of New Methods. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications.

Polanyi, M. (1967). The Tacit Dimension. New York: Doubleday & Co.

Rist, R. (December, 1987). Do teachers Count in the lives of children? A reply to Wineburg. In, Educational Researcher, (Glasser, ed.), Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Assoc, Vol. 16, No. 9.

_____. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 411-451.

Rosenthal, R. (December, 1987). Pygmalion Effects: Existence, Magnitude, and Social Importance. A reply to Wineburg. In, Educational Researcher, (Glasser, R., editor). Vol. 16, No. 9.

Schon, D. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Simon, R. & Dippo, D. (1986). On critical ethnography. Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Vol.17, pp. 195-202.

Sleeter, C. & Grant, C. (December, 1986). Success for all students. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 229-299.

Spindler, G.(editor). (1982). Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winton.

Spradley, J. (1979). The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Springfield, S. & Teddlie, C. (1987). A time to summarize: Six years and three phases of the Louisiana school effectiveness study. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.

Walberg, H. & Fowler, W. (October, 1987). Expenditure and size efficiencies of public school districts. Educational Researcher, (Russell, W.,ed.), Washington, D.C.: AERA Publication, Vol. 16, No.7, pp. 5-16.

Weber, G. (1971). Inner-City Children Can Be Taught To Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.

Wilcott, K. (1982). Ethnography as a methodology and its applications to the study of schooling: A review. In, Doing the Ethnography of Schooling, (Spindler, G., ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winton. pp. 456-489.

Wineburg, S. (December, 1987). The self-fulfillment of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Also, Does research count in the lives of behavioral scientists? A rejoinder. In, Educational Researcher, (Glasser, R., ed.). Vol. 16, No. 9., pp. 28-37, 42-44.

Appendix A:

The Implementation Checklist

PRIORITY ONE IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST
OFFICE OF PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

NOTE TO THE TEACHER: **Use of this checklist by research staff is a requirement of the Federal funding agency in order to document program implementation and assist in program improvement. The data are only used in summary form to describe the status of the program and never in individual form to describe a teacher. You are receiving a copy of the completed checklist for your use only. You are not obliged to share it with anyone else, but you are free to share it with anyone you wish, including your principal or supervisor.**

SCHOOL/# GRADES(S) SPECIAL PROGRAM:

RESEARCHER: DATE: TIME

STAFFING/GROUPING

.The teacher worked with the whole class _____
.The teacher worked with small groups/individual children _____
.The aide worked with small groups/individual children _____ or N/A
.The parent scholar worked with small groups/individual children _____ or N/A
.The volunteer(s) worked with small groups/individual children _____ or N/A

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS

.There was a posted schedule of instructional activities _____
.Classroom rules were posted _____
.There were reminders of the specific objectives of each activity _____
.There was use of open questions (content) _____
.There were clues given on how to respond to questions _____
.There was factual information given _____
.There was direct instruction in thinking _____
.There was indirect instruction in thinking _____
.There was evidence of formative testing _____
.There was evidence of special instruction for non-mastering students _____
.There was evidence of special instruction for students below grade level _____
.There was consistent use of positive reinforcement _____
.There was evidence that the teacher encouraged excellence _____
.The students asked questions of the adults _____
.The students talked to one another (approved/allowed by adults) _____
.The students were engaged in silent reading _____
.The students were engaged in writing _____
.The students were actively engaged in their work _____

INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT

(Indicate the number of children in each area during the 30 minute visit.)

_____ Reading/Language Arts
_____ Mathematics
_____ Science
_____ Social Studies
_____ Other _____
_____ Subject matter was integrated

_____

AREAS/MATERIALS IN ROOM

(Not necessarily in use)

_____ Library areas(s)
_____ Independent work area(s)
_____ Progress graphs/charts (teacher)
_____ Posted student work
_____ SCIS kits
_____ Bilingual/Bicultural/Ethnic materials
_____ Other _____

_____

_____ TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS (ACCOUNT FOR ALL TRANSIENTS)
_____ TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULTS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING PRIORITY ONE IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST
REPLICATING SUCCESS SCHOOLS/PRIORITY ONE
OFFICE OF PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

- NOTE: Each visit is to be at least 30 minutes long.

1. Complete the header information, i.e., a) the school name and number, b) the grade visited - indicate both grades if a split grade, c) whether or not this is a special program class, e.g., Transition Program (TP), d) the researcher signs his/her name, e) indicate the date, and f) enter the time the visit took place.

2. In the Staffing/Grouping section:
   a) "whole class" means the vast majority - one small group could be working independently of the rest

   b) indicate "N/A" (not applicable) if there is no aide, or parent scholar, or volunteer in the classroom during the visit.

3. In the Instructional Process section:
   a) a "posted schedule of instructional activities" refers to a clearly visible schedule of the day's activities, e.g., on the blackboard.

   b) "posted classroom rules" also refers to a clearly visible list of rules, e.g., on the blackboard.

   c) the term "reminders of specific objectives" refers to clear indications by the teacher that the activity is being undertaken for such and such an instructional purpose and/or is related to such and such an objective of the lesson or course.

   d) "open questions" are those questions whose focus is not a right or wrong answer, but rather the occasion for students to freely express an opinion, reaction, etc.

   e) "clues on how to respond" refer to attempts to paraphrase, reword, provide additional explanation of terms, etc. that help the student form an accurate response to a question.

   f) "factual information" refers to new information given to the students directly by the teacher.

   g) "direct instruction in thinking" refers to specific activities where the teacher/aide, through direct questions/directives, structures a session focusing on the improvement of explicit thinking skills, e.g., logical thinking, critical reasoning, etc.

   h) "indirect instruction in thinking" refers to activities where the teacher/aide does not initiate instruction, but uses students' independent interests/activities as the occasion to improve students' skills in thinking.

i) "evidence of formative testing" - refers to clear indications/statements that the teacher administered and utilized the results of an interim (formative) test between initial teaching to unit goals and end-of-unit tests. (This evidence may have to be obtained from direct questioning of the teacher.)

j) "evidence of special instruction for non-mastering students" - refers to clear indications that the teacher differentiates between students on the basis of need and provides instruction to meet this need, especially of non-mastering students. (The teacher may have to be questioned directly regarding which group(s) was non-mastering.)

k) "evidence of special instruction for students below grade level" refers to clear indications that, as above, the teacher has differentiated groups according to need, and that some special group(s) was made up of below grade level students (exact details may have to be gotten directly from the teacher).

l) "consistent use of positive reinforcement" refers to the consistent use, i.e., not isolated instances of very specific statements of praise about very specific performance on the part of students.

m) "evidence that the teacher encouraged excellence" refers to an atmosphere discernible in the classroom reflecting consistent teacher verbal and non-verbal messages to the students that they are capable of doing the work and of doing it well, and the converse of this, i.e., no evidence that the teacher ever puts down students in any way.

n) "students asked questions of the adults" - this is self-explanatory and probably the absence of any student question-asking is more noteworthy than its occurrence.

o) "students talked to one another" - note that the emphasis of this item is on those classrooms where the teacher clearly approves of student/student talk, or clearly does not object.

p) "students were engaged in silent reading" - i.e., at least one group of students was engaged in reading to themselves.

q) "students were engaged in writing" - at least one group was engaged in writing/copying at least whole sentences.

r) "students were actively engaged in their work" refers to clear indications that the majority of students were involved in the activities/assignments, etc.

4. In the Instructional Content section:

For each of the subject matter areas listed (or if subject matter areas were integrated, e.g., reading and social studies) indicate the number of children working in the area during the time of the visit.

5. In the Areas/Materials in Room section:

In this area check off any item listed if it is apparent in the room whether it is in use in the course of the visit or not.

FINAL NOTES: (1) Account for the total number of students in the room - including transients, e.g., pull-out situations - and the total number of adults. Enter the #s in the section provided; (2) give the teacher a copy of the completed checklist and assure the teacher that anonymity will be safeguarded and the results released only in summary form.